DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 267 UD 014 617

TITLE	Higher Horizons 100, 1973-1974. Hartford Moves Ahead: An Evaluative Report.
INSTITUTION	Hartford Public Schools, Conn.
PUB DATE	11 Oct 74
NOTE	55p.; Parts of this document will not be clearly legible on reproduction due to the print size and quality of the original; Reproduced from the best available copy
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Career Planning; *Compensatory Education Programs; Cultural Education; Cultural Enrichment; Guidance Services; High Schools; Middle Schools; *Program Evaluation; Remedial Instruction; *Secondary Education; *Urban Education; Vocational Counseling; Vocational Development
IDENTIFIERS	Connecticut; *Hartford; SADC; State Act for Disadvantaged Children

ABSTRACT

Originally planned to open in the fall of 1965 under funding from the Office of Economic Opportunity, and continued over the years with State Act for Disadvantaged Children funds, Higher Horizons 100 (HH100) was from its inception conceived as a ninth grade center where a compensatory program would work. Despite its expansion from one team to a present total of four high school and four middle school teams, HH100 as a program continued to provide articulated services geared toward skill remediation, guidance services, and cultural exploration and these to groups of approximately 100 urban youngsters in each of the program's eight centers. While the cultural activity funds were necessarily limited, team members were still able to provide youngsters with a number of vocational, experiential, and career services as these were contemplated in the original and in subsequent proposals. As a model for secondary school compensatory education, the original format was set up to enable the HH team to plan activities and programs in conjunction with the students. Through a series of systematic formal and informal planning sessions, team members would receive continual participant feedback and could use this information as a basis for modifying the program so as to better individually diagnose needs and prescribe appropriate educational treatments. (Author/JM)

HIGHER HORIZONS 100

- The Ninth Year -

WHY "HH 100?"

If compensatory education was to come into existence for the first time in 1974, in all probability "HH 100" wouldn't even happen. Too many cards are stacked against successful educational interventions at the secondary school level. In fact, much of the relevant literature seems to point out that to be really meaningful, a compensatory program should attack the problems of educational deprivation as early as possible and preferably at the pre-school level. Given this smaller logical chance for success and coupled to scarcity of finances, in all probability Higher Horizons would still be on the drawing board.

But, to paraphrase poet Bobby Burns, "the best laid plans of mice and men often go astray." And often good planning, a dedicated teaching staff, and a desire to help youngsters will out distance an actuarial description of success. "HH 100" was this kind of program. Originally planned to open in the fall of 1965 under funding from the Office of Economic Opportunity, and continued over the years with State Act for Disadvantaged Children (SADC) funds, "HH 100" was from its inception conceived as a ninth grade center where a compensatory program would work. Inherent in this concept was the development of a model by which it could be demonstrated that the more pervasive effects of educational deprivation could be corrected and, contrary to

some of the thinking which existed even at that time, at the high school level to boot! Initiated at the Hartford Public High School (HPHS), the program was oriented toward the remediation of reading and communication skills; a focus which was supplemented by added emphases on the improvement of other skill areas, the development of a better student self-concepts, and wider exposure to the educational, cultural, and vocational opportunities which existed in the Hartford area.

Patterned after the less than successful New York City program of the same name, Higher Horizons quickly gained a unique character of its own. Unlike the New York program, Hartford's model worked. But since it did have an unfavorable name coloration, the program was subject to a series of rigorous evaluations over its first four years of operation. The results of these evaluations was highly salutary, they were so favorable in fact, that the program received national recognition from the U. S. Office of Education and was subsequently expanded from its initial HPHS setting; first to the HPHS ninth grade Annex, next to Weaver High School, and finally through Barnard-Brown to the Fox and Quirk Middle Schools. These latter three expansions moved Higher Horizons program from the ninth grade level to encompass the seventh and eighth grade level in the city's two middle schools as well. And finally, during the 1973-74 school year, still another ninth-grade team was added at the Bulkeley High School Annex.

Despite its expansion from one team to a present total of four high school and four middle school teams, "HH 100" as a program continued to

provide articulated services geared toward skill remediation, guidance services, and cultural exploration and these to groups of approximately 100 urban youngsters in each of the program's eight centers. And while the cultural activity funds were necessarily limited, team members were still able to provide youngsters with a number of vocational, experiential, and career services as these were contemplated in the original and in subsequent proposals.

STATEMENT OF NEED

From its inception, "HH 100" was viewed by its designers as a constantly changing, rather than static program. As a model for secondary school compensatory education, the original format was set up to enable the Higher Horizons team to plan activities and programs in conjunction with the students, and on the basis of the results of the yearly evaluation. In addition, through a series of systematic formal and informal planning sessions, team members would receive continual participant feedback and could use this information as a basis for the adaption of new methodologies, techniques, and materials so as to better individually diagnose needs and prescribe appropriate educational treatments. This procedure, incidentally, was institutionalized by "HH 100" long before its "terminology" had been introduced into the educational mold. And while differential program changes do occur at each of the team sites, five complementary focal areas are always kept in mind.

1. Team flexibility is recognized as the one vital ingredient which is necessary if an atmosphere is to be provided in which experimenta-

tion, change, and program development can take place. To provide effectiveness to this flexibility, each team works with the particular problems of approximately 100 selected educationally disadvantaged students; hence the name, "Higher Horizons 100."

2. Students are helped to adjust not only to their regular school program but also to program changes as these might logically occur in future years. Here a long-range learning orientation is inherent in program operations.
3. Youngsters cannot learn without the basic skills which are necessary for a subject's mastery. Thus the remediation of specific learning deficiencies, and these particularly in the basic skill areas of reading, language arts, and mathematics must be provided.
4. Despite a shortage of cultural funds, available resources are targeted so far as is possible to expand the experiential backgrounds of the students. Here the emphasis is placed on developing educational, vocational, and future life-style orientations.
5. Last, but by no means least, the program is oriented toward helping youngsters to improve their own self-image. When a youngster recognizes his own worth and experiences success, then logically higher educational, vocational, and life-style goals can be expected. These in turn are furthered through the learning mastery which is an inherent theme of the program.

"HH 100's" five focal areas grew logically from a series of identified

student need statements. While these have changed slightly over the years, their basic content has remained the same. Specifically:

1. Cognitive needs
   a. To overcome language deficiencies particularly in the diagnosing and remediation of specific reading disabilities and in the application of reading skills to the content areas of science, mathematics, social studies and literature.
   b. To provide a significant increase in the mastery of the computation skills, concepts and problem-solving abilities relative to general mathematics and, once mastery is demonstrated or attained, to begin Algebra.
   c. To provide a test-table design for instructional development and experimentation so that the particular learning problems of these one hundred students can best be met.
   d. To increase mastery of the methods of inquiry, laboratory techniques, mathematical skills and reasoning abilities. At Weaver High School this is being developed specifically through laboratory-based physical science and social studies programs; at Fox through individualized seventh and eighth grade programs.
2. Affective needs
   a. To develop an improved self-concept which will hopefully lead to higher educational, vocational and life goals.

b. To develop the achievement motivation concerned with a striving for excellence in his educational, vocational and life goals.

c. To develop or modify those patterns of behavior by which the student can achieve his educational, vocational and life goals.

d. To expand the experiential backgrounds of the selected students beyond the levels which are currently attainable in their out-of-school environment.

In order that the goals of "HH 100" were met on both a team and program basis, several criterion were used for participant selection.

1. All students must reside in a validated school area; they must either be in grade 9 at Hartford Public High School, HPHS Annex, or Weaver High School, or in grades 7 and 8 at the Fox or Quirk Middle Schools.

2. Students should be of an "average" tested ability or be rated by their teachers as students who could perform at an average level of achievement.

3. The recorded reading level for each member of the group is generally from one to four years below the appropriate grade placement level. At the middle school level, tested levels in both reading and math should follow this pattern.

4. The students should be selected on the basis of emotional stability.

In establishing this criteria, it was stressed that the participants should not be considered serious disciplinary problems.

5. The student age levels should be kept relatively homogeneous. This factor was stressed at the high school level.
6. All students must be screened and approved by their feeder school counselor.
7. Flexibility in the criteria is stressed; thus counselors can make additional recommendations in special cases. All recommendations are, of course, discussed with the appropriate "HH 100" counselor and team leader prior to the students' final notification and selection.
8. Parental permission is required for participation in the "HH 100" program. This approval tends to facilitate the home-school cooperation which has proven to be successful in the past.

OBJECTIVES

On the basis of the preceding goals and need statements, and through a series of on-going planning steps, it has been possible to develop a series of program objectives. While these remain relatively constant, standards and criteria are sometimes modified as the result of constant changes in the program and on the basis of continued team, pupil, and parental feedback. To make these changes, the general needs of the target population are assessed on a yearly basis, and in conjunction with the selection criteria which have been specified. Next, team members work with each to develop an individualized

assessment so as to better determine his specific needs, strengths, and possible strategies for learning so as to provide help within the context of overall team operations. Finally, group and individual objectives are assigned subject, of course, to further modification as the youngster's learning progresses. Note here that while individualized objectives are particularly important to the instructional process, these are not by their nature amenable to group assessments because of the limited time and staff resources. Note also that as the objectives change, so too does the program. And, of course, these changes are usually not documented until the end of the project year.

To evaluate the overall "HH 100" concept, a series of program objectives were developed to represent "average" behavioral changes, and serve as a usable index by which one can look at overall program attainments. These objectives, measurement criterion, and standards together with team variations as these were developed to meet particular team need patterns were submitted for funding as follows:

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES

1. Objective. After having spent one year in "HH 100" with its special emphasis on the mastery of language skills, the learner will achieve month-for-month gains in reading achievement.
   Criterion. Gains will be measured by a group comparisons of the Metropolitan Achievement Reading Test subscores, administered either in May to May, or in September and May of the current school year. In addition, H.P.H.S. and H.P.H.S.

Annex will also utilize the Iowa Silent Reading Test while Weaver High School will administer the California Reading Test according to the cited schedule.

2. Objective. After having completed one year of Higher Horizons 100 math instruction, the learner will achieve a month-for-month mean gain in one or more of the following areas.

   Criterion.

   a. All teams will administer the Metropolitan Achievement Test Computation and Problem Solving subtests in accord with the previously stated schedule.

   b. W.H.S. will administer the Iowa Algebra Aptitude Test to students enrolled in Algebra I.

   c. Fox will participate in the W.H.S. math computation testing program.

3. Objective. After having spent one year in "HH 100" with concentrated emphasis on personal adjustment and academic improvement, the learner should achieve a more realistic self image toward school and society.

   Criterion. A pupil self-rating scale will be constructed by the evaluation office and will be administered to students at the end of the school year. In addition, and if time permits, the scale will also be administered to an appropriate control population, and to a sample of "HH 100" graduates at the succeeding grade

level to ascertain if behavioral gains are being carried into successive years of high school.

4. Objective. Given experience of varied activities and learning situations, the learner should achieve a better attendance record.

   Criterion. A percent of attendance will be calculated and will be used to compare "HH 100" attendance figures with:

   a. Previous grade cumulative attendance records for the group.

   b. Overall grade attendance figures at the host school at the end of the school year.

   A minimum 7% increase is expected.

5. Objective. W.H.S. After having spent one year in Higher Horizons Introductory Physical Science, the learners will show month-for-month gains in their ability to use scientific inquiry methods, problem solving techniques, and concepts relative to physical science.

   Criterion. Gains will be measured by the Introductory Physical Science Achievement Test, form C, administered in September and May of the school year.

DESCRIPTION

In actual operations, each Higher Horizons team differed from the overall model, and this on a day-to-day basis. Differences were occasioned from various strengths which were inherent in each team, the extent to which

school facilities could be made available, and the needs of the youngsters as these changed over the course of the school year. Add to this the fact that each team functioned under varying degrees of supervision from the school principal with little formal centralized direction. One can easily see that while the funding proposal did provide some degree of overall program guidance, the actual team operations were necessarily school rather than program oriented.

In addition to school and team oriented operational differences, the availability of outside funding also had its impact on team operations. At the high school level "HH 100" teams were generally funded in their entirety while at the middle schools, outside monies were minimal and these were generally used for guidance services. An obvious result here was that the high school programs tended to operate more independently than did the middle school teams. This independence seemed to be reflected in operations, planning strategies although not in the extent of planning, and in the use of available resources. The middle schools particularly tended to operate in a similar fashion with the other school clusters within their building thus conformed more closely to other school regulations and requirements.

Despite operational differences, each of the Higher Horizons teams continued to maintain the overall philosophical construct of the Higher Horizons program. This construct was carried out using a number of proven methodologies which have shown success in the past. Typically, these methodologies included the following:

1. The use of Instructional Teams. Teams made up of teachers, other specialists, and paraprofessionals worked to motivate and encourage each "HH 100" youngster to react positively to a program which was in all cases student-centered, but with varying degrees of individualization. Often the teams were supplemented by tutorial or other "outside" services.
2. Small group instruction. Since each team operated in a "mini-house" or cluster setting, its students could be taught in an environment which allowed the students to relate intimately to each other and to the various team members. Because this relationship was reciprocal, students seemed better able to obtain assistance in the solution of their specific learning and behavioral problems, than had been the case in their previous classrooms. While some outside support was provided, in general the program was carried on largely by the team members themselves.
3. Intensive counseling. In its original concept, a school counselor was to be assigned to each team on a full-time basis. Because of funding limitations, the middle school teams shared counseling services with other clusters. Here it was estimated that the counseling load was about 225 youngsters.
4. Cooperative planning and dialogue. Through a continuing series of both formal and informal gatherings, staff members were encouraged and helped in team settings to react, respond, and adjust to

the needs of their pupils. Here, again a majority of the "help" stemmed from the teachers and the members of the team.

5. Cultural activities. In contrast to many programs, cultural trips and experiences were pre-planned by the students and the teams, and these were evaluated as part of the total instructional process.

The actual composition of Higher Horizons teams tends to vary each year, although the program's focus on remediation, guidance, and self-exploration has remained intact. During the 1973-74 school year, team compositions were as follows:

1. H.P.H.S: The eight member team was composed of an English teacher, two language arts specialists, science, math and regional studies teachers, a project assistant, and a school counselor who also served as team leader.
2. H.P.H.S. Annex: Here the seven member team was made up of a teacher of English, area studies, general science and mathematics, a reading teacher, a project assistant and a guidance counselor. The English teacher served as team leader.
3. Weaver High School: This seven member team consisted of an English teacher, a social studies teacher, a reading teacher, a science teacher, a mathematics teacher, a guidance counselor, and a project assistant. At Weaver, the team leader was the English teacher.
4. Bulkeley Annex: The team leader, a counselor, assisted five

staff members and an aide.

5. Fox Middle School: One seven member team was made up of a half-time counselor, reading teacher, teachers of the four academic subjects and an aide. The second team was similarly constituded although a second English teacher substituted for the reading person. Team leaders were both math teachers.
6. Quirk Middle School: Two seven member teams each made up of a half-time counselor, reading teacher, aide, and four academic area teachers staffed the project. One team leader was a social studies teacher and the other a math teacher.

EVALUATION

When any program becomes decentralized to the point where it must operate on the basis of school by school requirements, and in response to the constraints which will emerge from divergent learning environments, it seems logical that differential patterns of populations, programs, and gains will necessarily result. The logic could certainly be applied to the Higher Horizons 100 program. With respect to student populations, for example:

1. The Quirk grade 7 team reported that teachers at some of the feeder schools did not understand the criteria that students were to have the potential to perform at an average level of ac e-ment. In consequence, some students with little ability e placed in the program. In addition, and because of school placement and class size problems, other youngsters were added

to the team. Parenthetically the total number of 106 students repeated does not appear to violate the number criterion excessively.

2. At the same Quirk 7 center, while the recorded reading level was to have been one to three years below grade placement, in practice some 24 students tested below the 4.0 level on at least one of the two Metropolitan reading subtests given in early fall.

3. Quirk 7 also reported that the criterion of emotional stability was not totally considered since several serious problems which needed the attention of the school psychologist and social worker were either assigned or added later to the program. Several students with serious truancy problems, one perceptually handicapped youngster, and two belonging in Basic Studies were also put under team aegis.

4. While the eighth grade Quirk team did not cite specific instances of guideline violations, they did point out that pressures were placed on the team to accept youngsters who did not meet the "HH 100" criteria. Apparently "many" of these children were placed with the team since they also reported limited input into student selection.

5. At Fox, both teams reported problems dealing with the placements of youngsters. One team pointed out that a lack of mobility into and out of the cluster kept improperly placed students in the

program while at the same time serving to exclude several good candidates. Both teams reported that young sters with emotional and social problems were incorrectly placed in the program to the point that an inordinate amount of staff time was spent dealing with these, rather than with instructional problems. One team suggested that some of the inappropriate placements were occasioned both by the Central Pupil Appraisal Team and the school administration although specific numbers were not reported.

6. No specific problems with the pupil population were reported at the high school level. On the basis of this lack of negative information it is probably safe to reaffirm the supposition that the high schools had more autonomy in the operation of their programs while the middle school programs were more responsive to other school and administrative considerations.

In terms of reported program differences:

1. SADC money was used to totally staff the HPHS center, while providing 5 team members at Weaver and 4 at the HPHS Annex.
2. Four SADC counselors were assigned to the four middle school teams but each carried an added client load. In addition, a project aide wås provided at Quirk and two team positions at Fox.
3. The Bulkeley Annex team received one SADC counselor.

As has already been reported, the availability of funding had a differ-

ential impact on the program. Since most of the funding related to staff costs, an assessment of staffing patterns is indicated. Positions funded under General and SADC budgets are shown by team and by program in the following table.

TABLE 1

Allocation of SADC and General Fund Positions

School	SADC	General Budget	SADC Funds
Fox Middle Team 1	1	5	$ 16,620
Fox Middle Team 2	3	4	41,830
Quirk Middle Team 1	1	6	18,170
Quirk Middle Team 2	2	5	16,800
HPHS	8	0	110,070
HPHS Annex	4	3	46,840
Weaver	5	2	51,750
Bulkeley Annex	1	6	13,160

Note: All figures have been rounded.

Each of the first two presentations should be considered separately since the level of scores will differ from one grade level to another.

HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMS

1. Question. After spending one year in a HH 100 program with its special emphasis upon the mastery of language skills, did learners on the average achieve month for month gains in reading achievement?

   Criterion.

   Mean gains which were measured by the comparison of Metropolitan Achievement Test reading scores administered in September and May of the school year, are reported as follows. Note that these test scores have also been subjected to a test of statistical significance to determine whether reported changes could logically be attributed to program effects, or were due only to chance instead. Where significance levels of .01 or .05 are reported, here the statistical probability that the change occurred due to chance is five out of one hundred (*) or one in one hundred (**); the reported change is probably a real one and not simply a mathematical fluke.

TABLE 2

Comparison of Mean Metropolitan Grade Equivalent Reading Scores by Team, School Year 1973-1974

Team	N	Pre WK	Post WK	Dif.	Sig.	N	Pre Read	Post Read	Dif.	Sig.
HPHS	84	6.6	7.0	+.4	**	84	5.2	6.7	+1.5	**
ANNEX	86	6.7	6.3	+.4	**	86	5.6	6.3	+ .7	**
WHS	84	6.5	6.9	+.4	**	84	6.2	6.9	+ .7	**
BHS	71	6.9	7.2	+.3	*	71	6.6	7.0	+ .4	*

Criterion.

Were the same kinds of reading gains apparent when measured by other means? Here the plan was for all teams with the exception of WHS to use the Iowa Silent Reading Test as a supplementary measure. Weaver was to have used the California Reading Test and both tests were to have been administered over the September to May period. Since teams used the Iowa for diagnostic purposes after initial screening with the MAT'S, this testing was not repetitive. Note that Weaver High School used the Iowa Silent Reading Test in conformity with the testing patterns of the other high school teams.

TABLE 3

Comparison of Mean Iowa Silent Reading Grade Equivalent Scores by Team,

School Year 1973-1974

Team	N	Pre test	Post test	Dif.	Sig.
HPHS	83	5.9	8.1	+2.2	**
ANNEX	83	5.9	8.8	+2.9	**
WHS	87	6.2	8.6	+2.4	**
BHS	68	6.6	7.6	+1.0	**

Findings.

a. When word knowledge and reading when measured by the Metropolitan, mean grade equivalent score gains at each of the four high school teams generally fell slightly below the standard stated in the objective. Word knowledge gains ranged from 3 to 4 months, although reading gains were somewhat higher; from .7 to 1.5 with the exception of BHS. Only HPHS attained the standard (month for month gains) on the reading subtest, although they fell behind by 5 months on the test of word knowledge.

b. All Metropolitan grade equivalent gains with the exception of BHS were statistically significant at the .01 level. Thus

it can be concluded that all test changes were due to program effects and not just to chance.

c. When the same objective was assessed on the basis of the Iowa Silent Reading Test, all teams met the standards and all teams except BHS substantially exceeded the standard by at least 1.2. All gains were statistically significant at the .01 level.

Conclusion.

On the primary measure - the MAT - objective standards were not met either by the program or by other than one team at the high school level. On the secondary measure, the standard was met by the program and by each of the teams.

2. Question. After completing one year of Higher Horizons 100 math instruction, did the learners achieve mean month for month gains in one or more of the following areas?

Criterion.

All teams received the Metropolitan Achievement Test arithmetic computation and problem solving sub sections either in September and May, or between May and May of the school year. These data are reported as follows:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 4

Comparison of Mean Metropolitan Grade Equivalent Mathematics Scores by Team, School Year 1973-1974

Team	N	Pre AC	Post AC	Dif.	Sig.	N	Pre PS	Post PS	Dif.	Sig.
HPHS	71	6.5	7.0	+.5	**	72	6.5	8.1	+1.6	**
ANNEX	86	6.1	6.8	+.4	**	86	6.4	6.8	+ .4	**
WHS	84	6.4	7.2	+.8	**	84	5.7	6.5	+ .8	**
BHS	68	6.9	6.9	-		71	6.8	7.1	+ .3	*

Findings.

a. Given an approximate testing span of eight to nine months (dependent, of course, on the actual dates of testing), HPHS reached the standard in problem solving, while WHS achieved the objective standard in both arithmetic computation and problem solving. Neither the Annex nor BHS met the standard in either area although all gains to include those which did not achieve the objective were statistically significant; at the .01 level for all teams except BHS (.05).

b. Additional testing using the Iowa Algebra Test for Algebra I students at Weaver High School was not reported.

Conclusion.

The objective standard was reached at HPHS and at WHS.

3. Question. Did one year of Higher Horizons with its inherent emphasis on personal adjustment which would [illegible] part from an associated

academic improvement generally help youngsters to achieve a more realistic self-image toward school and toward society?

Criterion.

A pupil self-rating scale was constructed by the evaluation office and this was administered to students at the end of the school year both at HPHS and at Weaver. Scores were tabulated and converted to percentages by item as shown on the following pages. Note here that overall, a favorable rating pattern was produced at each of the two sites. Rating scales were not submitted by the other high schools.

WEAVER HIGH SCHOOL

PROGRAM RATING FORM

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Directions

Read each question carefully. Answer each question carefully. Answer each question by checking the blank which best describes your reaction to the question. Check only one blank for each question.

It is not necessary to put your name on this paper.

N=88

TABLE 5

	Much	Some	None	Some Adverse Effects	Cannot Judge
Do you think Higher Horizons has helped you so far this year to:					
1. Improve your reading ability?	69%	26%	1%	0%	3%
2. Improve your study habits?	34%	36%	4%	3%	3%
3. Improve your attitude toward learning?	50%	42%	3%	0%	4%
4. Improve your classroom behavior?	38%	38%	16%	0%	7%
5. Improve your out-of-class behavior?	38%	31%	17%	0%	13%
6. Improve your getting along with your teachers?	37%	42%	12%	1%	7%
7. Learn more about yourself?	37%	41%	12%	1%	9%
8. Get specific help with your school work.	31%	45%	15%	0%	6%
9. Get help in working out your personal problems?	28%	32%	39%	0%	7%
10. Work toward a high school diploma?	58%	32%	4%	0%	6%
11. Look forward to an education training beyond high school?	51%	30%	9%	2%	7%
12. Identify some talents and interests which are other than academic?	51%	30%	6%	0%	7%
13. Expect to achieve at a higher level in school?	55%	23%	6%	0%	10%
Do you think Higher Horizons has:					
14. Increased your parents' interest in your school?	5%	55%	9%	0%	10%
15. Improved your parents' interest in your school work?	60%	23%	6%	0%	8%

How would you rate yourself?	All the time	Most of the time	Only some times	Never	Cannot Judge
16. I do my homework.	60%	26%	5%	2%	6%
17. I do not disturb others in class when they are working.	70%	20%	7%	3%	0%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	All the time	Most of the time	Only some times	Never	Cannot Judge
18. I can easily explain my ideas to others.	50%	32%	10%	1%	7%
19. I take part in class discussions.	4%	45%	10%	0%	5%
20. I want to learn and to improve myself.	60%	21%	15%	0%	11%
21. When I come to school I am ready for the lesson and the tests of the day.	33%	35%	20%	5%	5%
22. I feel I am doing better in classwork.	40%	35%	8%	2%	13%
23. I get along with the other students in my class.	38%	35%	17%	3%	6%
24. I finish my work on time.	50%	20%	14%	10%	5%
25. I have confidence in myself.	48%	30%	12%	4%	5%
26. I do the very best I can.	35%	37%	15%	6%	3%
27. I do my work without having to be told to do it.	33%	38%	5%	8%	16%

What part of Higher Horizons do you think has helped you most?

What do you like the most about the Higher Horizons program?

What do you like least about the Higher Horizons program?

What suggestions could you make to improve Higher Horizons?

Age _____ Grade _____ Sex _____

Figures furnished by team.

Research Evaluation
PRE 4/61

PROGRAM RATING FORM

DIRECTIONS: Read each question carefully. Answer each question carefully. Answer each question by checking the blank which best describes your reaction to the question. Check only one blank for each question.

It is not necessary to put your name on this paper.

HARTFORD PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL

	Much	Some	None	Some Adverse Effects	Cannot Judge
Do you think Higher Horizons helped you to:					
1. Improve your reading ability?	57%	41%	2%	0%	0%
2. Improve your study habits?	26%	61%	10%	0%	3%
3. Improve your attitude toward learning?	49%	43%	7%	2%	0%
4. Work toward a high school diploma?	46%	43%	2%	2%	8%
5. Look forward to an education/ training beyond high school?	30%	43%	10%	5%	13%
6. Expect to achieve at a higher level in school?	39%	49%	9%	2%	2%
Do you think Higher Horizons has:					
7. Increased your parents' interest in your school?	25%	46%	13%	3%	13%
8. Improved your parents' interest in your school work?	40%	45%	7%	5%	3%
How would you rate yourself?	All the time	Most of the time	Only some times	Never	Cannot Judge
9. I do my homework.	23%	52%	21%	5%	0%
10. I do not disturb others in the class when they are working.	13%	31%	34%	20%	2%
11. I can easily explain my ideas to others.	16%	44%	26%	7%	7%

N=54

TABLE 6

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	All the Time	Most of the time	Only Some times	Never	Cannot Judge
12. I take part in class discussions.	34%	26%	35%	5%	0%
13. I want to learn and to improve myself.	46%	46%	5%	3%	0%
14. When I come to school I am ready for the lesson and the tests of the day.	17%	53%	25%	6%	0%
15. I feel I am doing better in classwork.	23%	50%	18%	7%	3%
16. I finish my work on time.	15%	62%	18%	2%	3%
17. I have confidence in myself.	47%	43%	7%	0%	3%
18. I do the very best I can.	46%	41%	8%	3%	2%
19. I do my work without having to be told to do it.	18%	43%	25%	10%	5%

What part of Higher Horizons do you think helped you most?

Whatdid you like most about the Higher Horizons program?

What did you like least about the Higher Horizons program?

What suggestions could you make to improve Higher Horizons?

Age_____ Grade_____ Sex_____

Findings.

a. For the HPHS and Weaver Teams, a vast majority of the ratings could be characterized as providing "much" or "some" help to the students. In no instance was a substantial degree of "adverse effects" reported.

b. At the same time, HH100 student ratings of work and study attributes, while positive, were somewhat more conservative. Here the students tended to be somewhat critical of themselves in terms of doing homework, disturbing others in class when they are working, explaining ideas to others, taking part in class discussions, and doing work without being told. The general tendency was to rate these attributes as occuring "sometimes" or "most of the time," rather than "all the time."

c. Areas which were rated by the HH100 students as being of most help varied but a preponderance of comments were concerned with the four academic subjects of English, Reading, Math and Science. The students also reported that they liked the trips and their teachers while disliking either reading, homework, or "nothing at all." The fact that no adverse ratings were received from less than 5% of respondents is a particularly significant aspect of the youngsters positive perception of the program.

d. As to suggestions for the improvement of Higher Horizons, these were varied and pertained generally to areas such as too much

homework, more trips, etc. A substantial amount of respondents made no suggestions for program improvement however.

Criterion.

As part of the follow-up study, a Higher Horizons Alumni Form was distributed to Seniors who had been Freshmen in the HH 100 program four years ago. Of the 50 forms which were distributed, 15 replies were received. These were tallied and converted to percentages by the evaluation office At the same time, counselors were also asked to rate these HH 100 alumni in terms of their progress, attitudes, general citizenship, attendance, and perceptions of parent attitudes towards school. Counselors were also asked to report whether the student had improved, regressed, or stayed the same as in preceding years Alumni data, followed by counselor reports, are shown in Tables 7 and 8.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

67%	33%				N=15
40%	47%	7%		7%	
73%	20%			7%	
43%	21%	14%	7%	14%	
40%	40%		7%	13%	
33%	20%	27%	7%	13%	
33%	47%	7%		13%	
40%	40%	7%		13%	

TABLE 7

16%	36%	29%	18%	2%	N=46
18%	36%	31%	16%	-	
33%	31%	26%	11%	-	
22%	27%	20%	31%	-	
7%	31%	-	2%	60%	

38%	23%	38%
15%	20%	65%
7%	13%	80%
13%	29%	58%
4%	4%	93%

TABLE 8

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Criterion.

At HPHS, a Higher Horizons Parent Survey was also constructed and this was mailed to the parents of present Juniors who had been in the HH 100 program as Freshmen. Of the 52 forms which were distributed, 22 were returned and here a majority of the parents reported that the Higher Horizons program had produced "some" or "much" student improvement. Specific items and percentages of responses are shown in Table 9.

Class of _____

HIGHER HORIZONS PARENT SURVEY

Directions

When your son/daughter was in the ninth grade at Hartford Publich High School, he was in the Higher Horizons program. We would like to know how you feel about this program. Please help us to learn more about the program by answering the following questions. Answer by checking the proper line. Then mail this survey back in the envelope that is enclosed.

It is not necessary to put your name on this paper.

Higher Horizons student: Boy _____ or Girl _____

Since completion of Higher Horizons, have you noticed that your son/daughter:

		Much Improvement	Some Improvement	Little or No Improvement
1.	Wants to go to school?	65%	30%	5%
2.	Seems to understand his subjects?	50%	40%	10%
3.	Gets along better with other students?	60%	35%	5%
4.	Gets along better at home?	58%	37%	5%
5.	Reads more?	42%	37%	21%
6.	Seems to talk and understand more clearly?	65%	30%	5%
7.	Has become more interested in getting an education?	70%	15%	15%
8.	Is proud of school accomplishments?	67%	28%	6%

N=22

TABLE 9

How do you feel about the Higher Horizons program? Please comment:

Thank you for your cooperation.

Finding.

Once again data collected from the three groups of respondents indicate that the HH 100 program had perceived positive effects and in terms of each of the items which were examined.

Conclusion.

The objective was attained at HPHS and at Weaver. Information from the HPHS Annex and BHS teams were not reported.

4. Question. Did the Higher Horizons experience with its varied activities and learning situations result in a better attendance record for the youngsters?

Criterion.

A percentage of attendance was calculated and compared with the grade attendance figures of the host school. Because of an absence of complete records, the original plan to compare attendance figures with previous cumulative attendance records for each group was abandoned.

TABLE 10

Comparison of Attendance by Percentages,

School Year 1973-74

School	Percentage of Attendance Grade 9	HH Team
Bulkeley Annex	88%	95%
HPHS	74%	87%
HPHS Annex	84%	90%
Weaver High School	76%	95%

Note: Figures have been rounded.

Finding.

In all instances the standard for this objective was attained, and in some instances exceeded. Note particularly the salutary attendance patterns which could be reported at HPHS and at Weaver High School.

MIDDLE SCHOOL PROGRAMS

1. Question. After one year in a middle school Higher Horizons 100 program, did the students achieve average month-for-month gains in reading achievement?

   Criterion.

   Using the September to May testing cycle, reading skills were measured by the administration of the Metropolitan Achievement Test reading sub-sections. The resultant data are shown in Table 11, which follows. In this and in subsequent tables, and following previous procedure the Quirk teams have been designated as Quirk 7 and 8 according to the grade of their students while the Fox teams while ungraded so as to include both 7th and 8th grade students; have been designated Fox 1 and Fox 2.

TABLE 11

Comparison of Metropolitan Mean Reading Grade Equivalent Scores by Team

1973 - 1974 School Year

Team	N	Pre WK	Post WK	Dif.	Sig.	N	Pre Read	Post Read	Dif.	Sig.
Fox 1	91	5.0	5.5	+ .5	**	91	4.9	5.7	+ .8	**
Fox 2	85	5.1	5.8	+ .7	**	83	5.1	6.0	+ .9	**
Quirk 7	73	4.8	5.6	+ .8	**	73	4.5	6.0	+1.5	**
Quirk 8	105	5 8	7.3	+1.5	**	106	5.3	6.6	+1.3	**

Findings.

a. With no exceptions, mean gains which ran from .5 to 1.5 were statistically significant at the .01 level. Only Fox 2 and Quirk 7 achieved the month-for-month year standard (.8 - .9) in word knowledge, although all teams met the standard in reading comprehension.

b. Quirk 7 was the only team which was composed exclusively of seventh graders. While pre test levels expected were below the levels of the other teams which contained eighth grade youngsters, year score patterns were generally comparable to those achieved by eighth grade teams, and were greater than those achieved by the ungraded teams at Fox.

Criterion.

In addition to the use of the Metropolitan, both of the Fox teams also measured reading achievement with the Iowa Silent Reading Test, given in September and May of the school year. While testing was used primarily for diagnostic and placement purposes, data were available for analysis; these are shown as follows.

TABLE 12

Comparison of Mean Iowa Reading Grade Equivalent Scores by Team, School Year 1973 - 1974

Team	N	Pre Test	Post Test	Dif.	Sig.
Fox 1	91	5.4	6.5	1.1	**
Fox 2	102	5.8	6.5	+1.4	**

Finding.

Given the eight to nine month interval between testings, both Fox teams met the designated standard for this objective. In addition, recorded gains of 1.1 and 1.4 were statistically significant at the .01 level.

Conclusions.

The stated objective was achieved.

2. Question. After having completed one year of Higher Horizons 100, did learners achieve average month-for-month gains in mathematics?

Criterion.

All teams administered the Metropolitan arithmetic computation and problem subtests in conjunction with the previously discussed reading subtests in September and May of the school year.

TABLE 13

Comparison of Mean Metropolitan Arithmetic Grade Equivalent Scores by Team, School Year 1973 - 1974

Team	N	Pre AC	Post AC	Dif.	Sig.	N	Pre PS	Post PS	Dif.	Sig.
Fox 1	90	5.3	5.9	+ .7	**	91	4.5	4.9	+ .4	**
Fox 2	85	5.6	6.8	+1.2	**	84	4.8	6.0	1.2	**
Quirk 7	73	5.4	6.4	1.0	**	73	4.9	5.4	+ .5	**
Quirk 8	100	6.4	7.2	+ 8	**	96	5.7	6.6	+ .9	**

Finding.

a. The Fox 1 team failed to meet the objective standard in both areas while the Quirk 7 team did not meet the standard in problem solving. Gains which ranged from .4 to 1.2 were statistically significant at the .01 level.

b. Participation in the W.H.S. math computation testing program was not reported by Fox.

Conclusion.

Both Quirk teams and Fox 2 met acceptable standards for objective attainment, although Fox 1 did not achieve the objective. For the overall program then, the objective was achieved.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. Question. Given the MAT data presented in Tables 11 and 13, how did these scores compare with those collected from middle school youngsters as a whole?

Criterion.

Since Spring MAT Scores in the areas of reading and mathematics were available at both middle schools, averages were used for comparative purposes. These data are shown in Table 14 which follows.

TABLE 14

Comparison of Higher Horizons Grade Equivalent Scores with School Averages, Spring 1973

School	WK	Read	AC	PS
Fox Grade 7	5.0	5.0	5.5	4.7
Fox Grade 8	5.9	5.7	6.2	5.4
HH 1	6.2	5.7	5.7	5.3
HH 2	5.8	5.8	6.0	5.6
Quirk Grade 7	5.5	5.4	5.9	5.1
HH 7	5.5	5.4	6.7	6.0
Quirk Grade 8	5.9	5.7	6.2	5.4
HH 8	6.5	6.3	7.3	6.4

Finding.

As can be seen from the preceding table, Higher Horizons teams generally equaled and frequently bettered the averages which were produced by their grade levels as a whole. At Fox, teams were non-graded so that actual comparisons with either grade 7 or grade 8 averages are difficult to make; these scores can only be used as guidelines. At Quirk, on the other hand, teams followed grade level patterns and here accurate comparisons were possible. Again, Higher Horizons equaled or excelled overall grade scores.

4. Question. Following one year of experience in the Higher Horizons 100 program, did youngsters generally appear to achieve a more realistic self-image toward school and society?

Finding.

While a pupil self-rating scale had been constructed by the evaluation office and was used in previous year, neither the scale nor any criterion was used by teams at the middle school level.

5. Question. Given the varied activities and learning situation which are inherent in the Higher Horizons program, did youngsters on an average achieve a better attendance record than that of the host grade as a whole?

Criterion.

Two criterion were to have been utilized. First, a percentage of attendance would be calculated for each Higher Horizons group. This was to have been compared with previous cumulative group attendance records. Once again this procedure proved to be impractical. Since many student records were incomplete and youngsters entered the middle school teams through-

out the year, even when previous attendance records were available logical comparisons could not be made. Instead, a second criterion, to compare the percentage of attendance with sending grade figures was used and here a standard of a minimum 7% increase was established. Comparative percentages of attendance for sending school grades and for middle school teams are shown as follows:

TABLE 15

Comparison of Attendance by Percentages,

School Year 1973-74

School	Percentage of Attendance Grade	HH Team
Fox Middle	88% (ungraded)	
HH 1		92%
HH 2		92%
Quirk Middle		
Grade 7	86%	
Grade 8	85%	
HH 7		91%
HH 8		94%

Note: Figures have been rounded.

Findings.

a. In all instances, team percentages of attendance exceeded those which were reported for the appropriate host school grade levesl. All but one of the percentages fell above the 90% mark.

b. At the same time, the objective standard - to exceed the grade attendance percentage by 7 or more points - was not reached by any of the four teams. Because all percentages appeared to be "topping" the possible level of expectancy, a sliding scale has been suggested as the basis for standard This recommendation will be incorporated into the evaluation next year.

Conclusion.

While the objective standard was not met by any of the middle school teams, the essence of the objective - to improve overall attendance - was met.

6. Question. What other evaluative data were gathered by the various teams?

Findings.

1. At the Quirk eighth grade team, the Specific Language Disability Test was given to selected students. Of these 21 students, 16 were found to be perceptually handicapped in varying degrees. While it was reported that attempts were made by the team to help these children recognize and cope with their particular problems, no information was submitted regarding the effects of these

activities either on the children or on the program as a whole.

2. At the Fox Middle School, the Individualized Computational Skills Program was used with each student "plugged" into specific skill areas. While recordkeeping was reported as being extensive, no actual data were furnished.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

By the end of the ninth year of operation, Hartford's Higher Horizon 100 program had grown from a single ninth grade demonstration center located at the Hartford Public High School to a project which now encompassed four high school and four middle school programs. While all teams operated under a unified concept and philosophy, differences did occur in the various team operations; these were occasioned largely by differences in grade levels, in team and in school compositions, and in degrees of operational autonomy. Despite these differences, however, a number of common findings could be reported at the end of the project year.

For the high school teams:

1. The standard of month-for-month mean reading gains was achieved only at Hartford Public High School on the primary achievement measure, the MAT. On the secondary measure, the Iowa Silent Reading Test, the standard was met and exceeded by each of the four high school teams. All gains were statistically significant at the .01 level.
2. Month-for-month mean mathematics gains were achieved by

the teams at Hartford Public High School and at Weaver. Team gains with the exception of Bulkeley High School were statistically significant at the .01 level. The Bulkeley team gains reached only the .05 level.

3. A vast majority of queried Weaver High School and Hartford Public High School participants reported that the program helped them and in a number of different ways. These students also reported that they were attending to a number of activities which had been deemed necessary for school success. In addition, questions dealing with future aspirations and with the effects of the program upon parental interest were also rated quite favorably by respondents.

4. Alumni surveys from parents and students who had participated in the Higher Horizons program at Hartford Public High School reported that the effects of the program were continuing in subsequent high school years. Counselors of these students reported similar patterns, although to a lesser extent.

5. In all instances, HH team percentages of attendance exceeded those at comparable grade levels at the host school. Because attendance figures were "peaking", team averages did not exceed school averages by 7% percentage points. Here a sliding standard scale has been recommended.

At the middle school level:

1. All four middle school teams made month-for-month gains in one or more of the measured areas of reading; one team at each school reached the standard on both MAT subtests, while Fox also met the standard in the Iowa. All gains were statistically significant at the .01 level.

2. In arithmetic, Fox 2 and Quirk 8 teams made month-for-month average gains in both tested areas while Quirk 7 met the standard in computation only. Generally the objective standard was met.

3 Middle school Higher Horizons teams generally equaled and frequently bettered the achievement averages in reading and in arithmetic which were produced by their host school grade levels.

4 In all instances, middle school team attendance averages exceeded those which were reported by host school grade levels For all teams percentages exceeded grade level percentage levels by 7 or more points, the standard for the objective.

On the basis of the data which were collected, it can be concluded once again that the Higher Horizon program has substantially met a majority of its specified objectives during this, its ninth consecutive project year. Moreover, Higher Horizons through its series of continuing successes has shown to Hartford, and through various dissemination efforts, the nation as a whole that compensatory education can and does work at the secondary school level. These achieved goals were original reasons for Higher Horizons; reasons which have been justified over nine years of successful program operations.

Evaluation Office
October 11, 1974

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Date October 22, 1974

1973-74 SADC - TITLE I ESEA PROJECT EVALUATION

Town Hartford

Prgm Director Robert Barry, Dino Galiano

Address 249 High St., Htfd., Conn.

Prgm Evaluator Robert J. Nearine

Program Title Higher Horizons 100

Period of Program:
(x)sch yr only
( )summer only
( )sch yr & sum

Program length in weeks 36

Project Number: 64-1

Program Funds:
SADC: $ 314,375
Title I: $
_____: $
(Specify any other)

1. Program Participants

Total public school pupils 830

Total nonpublic school pupils _____

2. Schools where programs took place:

HPHS, HPHS Annex, Bulkeley Annex, Weaver, Quirk, Fox Middle

Grade level breakdown for all pupils served:

Pk	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Other
								239	230	361				

3. Economic and educational criteria used to select pupils for services of the program:

a. Reside in a validated school area. (continued on next page)

4. Number and type of staff to whom SADC or Title I funds were paid:
15 Teachers, 7 Counselors, 2 Paraprofessionals, .7 Clerical

5. Principal objectives related to pupils' achievement and attitudes:
a. Month-for-month measured gains in reading and math.
b. Improve self-image.
c. Improve attendance, 7% above grade norms.

6. Description of program activities and services:

Briefly stated, Higher Horizons 100 continues to function as a secondary school urban demonstration area which is intended to prove that some of the most salient ravages of educational deprivation can effectively be corrected. The program

3. continuation

b. Of average testing ability or rated by teachers as being able to perform at an average level of achievement.

c. Reading 1 to 4 years below grade level.

7. Evaluation of the principal goals of the program, measures used, results, and an interpretation of what the results mean.

For the high schools:

a. Month-for-month mean reading gains were achieved at HPHS on the MAT. This standard was also met and exceeded by each of the four teams on the Iowa Silent Reading Test. All gains were significant at the .01 level.

b. HPHS and Weaver made month-for-month gains on the MAT reaching the .01 level of significance. Bulkeley did not meet the month-for-month standard, although gains were significant at the .05 level.

c. At WHS and HPHS a majority of participants reported that the program helped them and that they were attending to activities which were deemed necessary for school success. Items dealing with future aspirations and the program's effect upon parental interest also received favorable ratings.

d. An HPHS alumni survey of parents and students reported that the effects of the program were continuing in subsequent school years. Counselors verified this item, although to a lesser extent.

e. In all instances, team percentages of attendance exceeded those of comparable grade levels. Teams did not meet the standard of +7 percentage points, but since attendance was "peeking," a sliding standard scale is recommended.

For the middle schools:

a. All teams made month-for-month gains in one or more of the measured areas of reading on the MAT, while one team at each school reached the standard on both MAT subtests. Fox also met the standard on the Iowa. All gains reached the .01 level.

b. In arithmetic, Fox 2 and Quirk 8 teams made month-for-month average gains while Quirk 7 achieved standard in computation only.

c. Team reading and arithmetic achievement averages generally equalled and frequently bettered comparable averages produced by the host school grade levels.

d. In all instances attendance averages exceed those reported by the host school grade level by 7 or more percentage points.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

8. Title I funds are provided to serve children from low-income areas regardless of whether they attend public or private schools. If children going to nonpublic schools resided in the school attendance areas validated for Title I, ESEA services in your community, provide the following:

   a. Where Title I services were rendered, indicate the number of children and the name(s) of the nonpublic schools they attended.

   not applicable

   b. Describe the specific services nonpublic school children received.

   not applicable

   c. Indicate the dollar amount of Title I, ESEA funds used for the above services.

   not applicable

9. Aside from the evaluation made of program objectives, indicate any successful outcomes resulting from Title I or SADC efforts in the town during the past year.

   None

10. Aside from the evaluation made of program objectives, indicate any problems resulting from Title I or SADC efforts in the town during the past year.

See pages 14 - 16.

11. State the recommendations for the future consideration of the programs. Base the recommendations on the findings and conclusions of this evaluation report.
    1. Rigorous attention to the evaluation design, with particular respect to follow-up studies should be instituted.
    2. Rigorous attention should be given to placement criteria, particularly at the middle school level.
    3. Administrative coordination of the various activities should be centralized.

12. Report the standardized test results for program pupils on the following pages. Report results so that pre- and post-test scores are for the same pupils. Report results for only those pupils who were administered the appropriate levels of the test for the pupil's school grade placement.

    The test results are organized to help in a statewide analysis of SADC and Title I. Report scores for a single subtest in reading, math, or language where these are related to the program being offered. Note that group scores have been requested for specific grade levels only on page 4, while page 5 has been organized for all other test information which cannot be included on page 4.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STANDARDIZED TEST INFORMATION FOR READING, MATH, AND LANGUAGE

Town Hartford Proj. # 64-1,2 Type Program Skill Development

Gr Lvl for Group Scores	Test Instrument Information: Name of Test and Year Published	Name of Subtest	Pre & Post Test Lvls	Pre & Post Test Forms	No. of Pupils Tested	Raw Scores and Grade Equivalence: Time of Pre Test*	Mean Scores r.s. / g.e.	Time of Post Test*	Mean Scores r.s. / g.e.
Reading									
Gr 1			/	/			/		/
Gr 2			/	/			/		/
Gr 3			/	/			/		/
Gr 4			/	/			/		/
Gr 5			/	/			/		/
Gr 6			/	/			/		/
Gr 7	MAT '70	Read	adv. / adv.	BM / AM	73	7.1	4.5	7.8	6.0
Gr 8	MAT '70	Read	adv. / adv.	BM / AM	106	8.1	5.3	8.8	6.6
Math									
Gr 1			/	/			/		/
Gr 2			/	/			/		/
Gr 3			/	/			/		/
Gr 4			/	/			/		/
Gr 5			/	/			/		/
Gr 6			/	/			/		/
Gr 7	MAT '70	AC	adv. / adv.	BM / AM	73	7.1	5.4	7.8	6.4
Gr 8	MAT '70	AC	adv. / adv.	BM / AM	100	8.1	6.4	8.8	7.2

					CA at Pre Test	Mean Scores r.s. / MA	CA at Post Test	Mean Scores r.s. / MA
Language								
Pk		/	/			/		/
K		/	/			/		/

*Record date of testing in grade equivalent units. If the pretest is between September 15 and October 14 for fourth graders, record it as 4.1, for example. If the post-test is between May 15 and June 14, record it as 4.9. If during other months, use the same rationale.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STANDARDIZED TEST INFORMATION
NOT INCLUDED ON PRECEDING PAGE

Town Hartford Proj. # 64-1,2 Type Program Skill Development

Gr Lvl for Group Scores	Test Instrument Information: Name of Test and Year Published	Name of Subtest	Pre & Post Test Lvls	Pre & Post Test Forms	No. of Pupils Tested	Raw Scores and Grade Equivalence: Time of Pre Test*	Mean Scores r.s. / g.e.	Time of Post Test*	Mean Scores r.s. / g.e.	For Test Info Where G.E. Scores Are Not Available
9	MAT '70	WK	Adv. / Adv.	BM / AM	325	9.1	6.6	9.8	6.9	
9	MAT '70	Read	Adv. / Adv.	BM / AM	325	9.1	5.9	9.8	6.7	
9	Iowa Silent Reading '56		Adv. / Adv.	AM / BM	321	9.1	6.2	9.8	8.3	
9	MAT '70	AC	Adv. / Adv.	BM / AM	309	9.1	6.5	9.8	7.2	
9	MAT '70	PS	Adv. / Adv.	BM / AM	309	9.1	6.4	9.8	7.1	
7-8	MAT '70	WK	Adv. / Adv.	BM / AM	186	.1	5.1	.9	5.7	
7-8	MAT '70	Read	Adv. / Adv.	BM / AM	174	.1	5.5	.9	5.9	
7-8	MAT '70	AC	Adv. / Adv.	BM / AM	175	.1	5.5	.9	6.4	
7-8	MAT '70	PS	Adv. / Adv.	BM / AM	175	.1	4.7	.9	5.5	
7-8	Iowa Silent Reading '56		Adv. / Adv.	BM / AM	193	.1	5.6	.9	6.5	
			/	/			/		/	
			/	/			/		/	
			/	/			/		/	

*Record date of testing in grade equivalent units. If the pre-test is between September 15 and October 14 for fourth graders, record it as 4.1, for example. If the post-test is between May 15 and June 14, record it as 4.9. If during other months, use the same rationale.